

## REMARKS

Claims 1-22 were previously pending in this patent application. Claims 1-22 stand rejected. Herein, Claims 1, 8, and 15 have been amended. Support for the amendments to the claims is found on, but not limited to, Figures 2-3C, page 4 lines 13-21, page 5 lines 1-8, page 6 lines 1-21, page 7 lines 1-8, page 8 lines 18-20, and page 9 lines 1-16 of the Specification. Accordingly, after this Amendment and Response, Claims 1-22 remain pending in this patent application. Further examination and reconsideration in view of the claims, remarks, and arguments set forth below is respectfully requested.

### 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) Rejections

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lord et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2003/0028514 (hereafter Lord). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully asserted that Lord does not disclose the present invention as recited in Independent Claim 1. In particular, Independent Claim 1 recites the limitation, "creating a particular shared object; at a point in time after said creation, providing to said particular shared object an attribute that indicates any object created in said particular shared object after said point in time is designated as node-specific while any object existing in said particular shared object prior to said point in time maintains designation as shared," (emphasis added). This temporal limitation of Independent Claim 1 is not disclosed by Lord. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 1 is not anticipated by Lord and is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 2-7 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 1, which is allowable over Lord. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 2-7 are patentable over Lord for the reasons discussed above.

With respect to Independent Claims 8 and 15, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 8 and 15 have similar limitations as Independent Claim 1. Independent Claim 8 recites the claim limitation, “creating a particular shared object; at a point in time after said creation, providing to said particular shared object an attribute that indicates any object created in said particular shared object after said point in time is designated as node-specific while any object existing in said particular shared object prior to said point in time maintains designation as shared,” (emphasis added).

Further, Independent Claim 15 recites the limitation, “a cluster file system configured to create a shared object and to automatically provide support for node-specific objects in said shared object, wherein at a point in time after creation of said shared object, said cluster file system provides to said shared object an attribute that indicates any object created in said shared object after said point in time is designated as node-specific while any object existing in said shared object prior to said point in time maintains designation as shared, wherein any object designated as shared in said shared object is available to said nodes, and wherein any object designated as node-specific in said shared object is available solely to a corresponding node of said nodes,” (emphasis added). As argued above, Lord fails to disclose the cited claim limitations of Independent Claims 8 and 15. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 8

and 15 are not anticipated by Lord for the reasons discussed with respect to Independent Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 9-14 and Dependent Claims 16-22 are dependent on allowable Independent Claims 8 and 15, respectfully, which are allowable over Lord. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 9-14 and Dependent Claims 16-22 are patentable over Lord for the reasons discussed above.

### CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the above claims, arguments and remarks overcome all rejections and objections. All remaining claims (Claims 1-22) are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited references. For at least the above-presented reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims (Claims 1-22) are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO HAO & BARNES, LLP

Dated: 2/6/2008

Jose S. Garcia

Jose S. Garcia  
Registration No. 43,628

Two North Market Street, Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 938-9080 ext. 128 Direct Line  
(408) 938-9060 General Line